

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated December 7, 2006, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by March 7, 2007.

Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-16 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, it was requested that the previously submitted amendment to the specification should be filed separately on a separate sheet of paper with its own title. The disclosure and claims 1 and 14-16 were objected to for various informalities. Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,711,457 to Wezel. Claim 14 was further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,741,016 to Barton et al. Claim 14 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,505,840 to Huggins et al. Claims 10 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,907,553 to Lundin. Claims 10 and 15 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by GB 191959 to Herbert. Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mack 2005/0023774 ("Mack"). The previous indicated allowance of claims 9, 10, and 12 was withdrawn in view of the newly discovered references to Lundin, Herbert, and Mack.

The Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 1, 3-7, 9 and 11-13.

In the present amendment, the abstract of the disclosure, as amended in the last amendment, appears on a separate page.

The specification was amended on page 1 to change “DE 10109474 A1 to “DE 10109490 A1”, as requested by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 14, 15, and 16 were amended to address the claim objections.

With regard to the rejections of the claims under Section 102, claim 14 has been amended to incorporate the features of independent – and allowable – claim 1.

Under Section 6 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner maintains that the cited reference to Huggins discloses a base body 20 with a slide surface 29. The Applicants respectfully disagree. In column 2, lines 57-58 of Huggins, if the following is disclosed: “Body (20) includes a plurality **of passageways (29)** for receipt of the jaws” (emphasis added).

A slide surface, as recited in amended claim 14, is **not disclosed** by Huggins. In addition, passageways in the base body are provided, which serve for receiving and guiding of the jaws. Neither the description nor Figs. 1-4 of Huggins discloses or shows the feature of a slide surface.

Likewise, the cited patents to Wezel, Barton, Lundin, Herbert and Mack all fail to disclose or show the feature of the slide surface, as recited in amended claim 14. Because amended claim 14 includes features that are not disclosed by the cited references, the rejections under Section 102 should be withdrawn. Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim.

Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 221

USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Because amended claim 14 includes the features of allowable, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3-7 and 9-13 all depend on claim 1, these claims should all be allowable on the same grounds as claim 1.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all of claims 1, 3-7, and 9-16 are patentable over the cited art. The Applicants further request withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration of the claims as herein amended.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Michael J. Striker /

Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700